

THE EUCHARIST AND MINISTERIAL LEADERSHIP

The ministerial leadership of the Eucharist is clearly one of the more vexing questions facing liturgical and sacramental theology today. It is axiomatic that the questions one asks determine the answers one gets. In this essay I hope to find the right—or at least helpful—questions in order to clarify an issue that has become so clearly problematic for many late-twentieth-century Catholics. I intend to accomplish this by asking three questions:

(1) What can modern approaches to symbol, sacramentality and sacrament tell us about ministerial leadership?

(2) On what bases are judgements made about the role of the minister of the Eucharist; that is, on the basis of what personal attributes?

(3) What is the yield of a historical-critical liturgical theology of the Eucharist for the question of ministerial leadership?

Although most of the considerations that follow will focus on the relation between ordained ministry and eucharistic celebration, it should be clear from the outset that contemporary eucharistic leadership is flawed if it is limited to the roles played by the ordained. In other words, by the end of this paper one can hope to elaborate a much broader understanding of ministerial leadership than can be confined to bishops, presbyters and deacons. Such an approach is warranted by the retrieval of a vision of an organically ordered Church where all have an active and important role to play in liturgical celebration.¹

I. A NEW PARADIGM FOR SYMBOL AND SACRAMENT

Most of the sacramental theology written in the last few decades has profited greatly from a newer appreciation of the role of symbol and ritual in human life.² In the process we have found that symbols and rituals operate at a level far deeper and more complex than rational argument for they resonate with multiple

¹See Vatican II, *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* (1963) #26, 28-29; Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship, *General Instruction on the Roman Missal*, 2nd ed. (1975) #59-73.

²E.g., see George Worgul, *From Magic to Metaphor* (New York: Paulist Press, 1980); Michael Lawler, *Symbol and Sacrament* (New York: Paulist Press, 1987); David Power, *Unsearchable Riches: The Symbolic Nature of Liturgy* (New York: Pueblo, 1984); Bernard Cooke, *Sacraments and Sacramentality* (Mystic CT: Twenty-Third Publications, 1983); and especially, Louis-Marie Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament: A Sacramental Reinterpretation of Christian Existence*, trans. Patrick Madigan and Madeleine Beaumont (Collegeville MN: Liturgical Press, 1995).

levels of meaning and shape us far more powerfully than we can imagine.³ Most scholars of symbol and ritual seem to agree that the symbols must be regarded as multivalent or polysemous to retain their power. This affirmation is no doubt apt for a religious faith tradition like Christianity which insists on both the incarnate and transcendent aspects of God. In the process of discerning the multilayered nature of symbols and rituals one can arrive at the conclusion that the very structure of human consciousness points to their ineluctable use for human living. At the same time we can affirm that such symbols and rituals point beyond themselves since one can never entirely control or capture their meaning. Thus one is always left with the paradox that although symbols and rituals are inevitable (and very much the stuff of human activity) they can lead to the experience of the transcendent. The Christian (in particular the Catholic) tradition has generally understood this by affirming the inherently sacramental nature of Christian faith.

But one can also point to the broadening of the use of the term "sacrament" in modern Roman Catholic theology, its use as an analogous term by Karl Rahner and Edward Schillebeeckx, and especially its application to the Church in the documents of the Second Vatican Council.⁴ Without denying the Tridentine affirmation of the seven sacraments of the Church, modern theology has been able to fit sacraments into a framework that respects appreciation of symbol and ritual consonant with contemporary cultural anthropology and philosophy. Given the inherently multivalent nature of symbol it is appropriate to understand the term "sacrament" as somewhat fluid. Thus, not only can one say that Christ is the sacrament of God, the Church the sacrament of Christ and the seven sacraments seven realizations of the activity of God in Christ and therefore the Church, but also that there is a continuity between the potential grace-filled encounter between human beings and within human communities that expresses God's saving activity.

I suggest that we might consider this approach a "High Sacramentality from below" similar to a High Christology from below that affirms the divinity of Christ while at the same time beginning from the faith experience of the disciples of Jesus.⁵ Admittedly the terms "high," "low," "from above," and "from below"

³See Walter Goldschmidt, *The Human Career: The Self in the Symbolic World* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990) 70-76; William Doty, *Mythography: The Study of Myths and Rituals* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1986) 72-106.

⁴Karl Rahner, *Foundations of Christian Faith*, trans. William V. Dych (New York: Seabury Press, 1978) 411-13; Edward Schillebeeckx, *Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter of God*, trans. Paul Barrett et al. (London: Sheed and Ward, 1963); Herbert Vorgrimler, *Sacramental Theology*, trans. Linda M. Maloney (Collegeville MN: Liturgical Press, 1992) 27-40.

⁵Eberhard Jüngel, *God as the Mystery of the World*, trans. Darrell L. Guder (Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1983); Jürgen Moltmann, *Trinity and Kingdom*, trans. Margaret Kohl (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981); Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament*, 492-508.

are often used in a confused manner and have limited usefulness. But a method from below which takes account of anthropological, social and psychological factors need not result in a watered-down sacramental theology, one that refuses to make affirmations about divine activity.⁶ Rather it can operate out of the conviction that God is always and already operating in human affairs, that grace or at least its potential acceptance by human beings is everywhere to be found. This is what I take to be the thrust of Karl Rahner's "Copernican Revolution" in sacramental theology, so well expressed in his masterful essay "Considerations on the Active Role of the Person in the Sacramental Event."⁷ The gracious encounter with God that Roman Catholics affirm in official sacramental events is not so much God dipping down into the world as it were, from without, but rather the focussed and exemplary moment of God's gracious activity already to be found in the world.⁸

In speaking this way one obviously runs the risk of reducing sacramental/liturgical events to merely natural events, in other words, ones which would not require the activity of the Church acting explicitly in the power of the Holy Spirit. In starting "from below," however, one can attend both to the irrevocable self-gift of God to the world in Jesus Christ (grace as ever present) and also to the special character of sacramental events, which I am calling a "High Sacramentality." One aspect of this "High Sacramentality" is what I take to be the Catholic tradition's insistence on *ex opere operato*, the Church's conviction that God is at work in these events when properly celebrated. By properly celebrated I mean, not arbitrary rubrics, but rather the explicit acknowledgement of the power of God in these events by means of the proclamation of the scriptural word and prayer which expresses the reliance of the event upon God's bestowal of the Holy Spirit. On the basis of what was said about the analogous use of the term "sacrament," at the same time that we affirm an explicit act of God in sacramental activity we need to note that the notion of sacrament exists on a continuum. So much of the history of sacramental theology has been occupied with the minimal questions of validity that we have tended to lose sight of this continuum .

⁶Here I am expressing in different terms the insight of Edward J. Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy: Theology and Practice*, vol. 1, *Systematic Theology of Liturgy* (Kansas City: Sheed and Ward, 1988) 186. Kilmartin insists on *anabatic* as well as *katabatic* dimensions of Christian liturgy, working his proposal out by employing the Bestowal Model of the Trinity formulated by David Coffey, *Grace, the Gift of the Holy Spirit* (Sydney: Catholic Institute, 1979).

⁷Karl Rahner, "Considerations on the Active Role of the Person in the Sacramental Event," in *Theological Investigations*, vol. 14, trans. David Bourke (New York: Seabury Press, 1976) 161-84.

⁸I am borrowing the term "focus" from John Macquarrie, *Principles of Christian Theology*, 2nd ed. (New York: Scribner's, 1977) 449. Macquarrie himself (vii) admits his reliance upon the theology of Rahner.

Our approach to "High Sacramentality from below" can be illustrated from the Jewish tradition of prayer, the soil out of which Christian prayer emerged. At issue here is the notion of "blessing." It is well known that the *eucharistia* of Christians bears strong resemblance to the *berakah* of Jewish prayer. The table prayers of *Didache* 9/10, for example, demonstrate an undeniable connection with the Jewish *Kiddush* blessing before meals and the *birkat-ha-mazon* (grace after meals), even if one cannot recapture the exact wording of the first century Jewish blessing with any confidence.⁹ The essence of *berakah* is to be found in its intentionality. God is not asked to bless profane objects or actions in the world. Rather the divine is blessed or acknowledged for that which already is, releasing it for human enjoyment or use.¹⁰ Lawrence Hoffman calls this form of prayer a kind of "spiritual amoeba," incorporating all other forms of worship. He notes that instead of asking a blessing on the profane world, the Jew asks God to release what is already sacred for human use.¹¹

This understanding of blessing is helpful in grounding a sacramental theology "from below," for it reveals a tradition of piety and prayer that recognizes the world as fundamentally graced. Moreover, the genre *berakah* is also the spiritual foundation of the prayers Jesus is reported to have employed at the Last Supper. A mistranslation of Mark 14:22 in the New Revised Standard Version of the Bible illustrates the confusion that has been experienced with regard to the notion of blessing and its Jewish origins. The NRSV has:

While they were eating, he took a loaf of bread,
and after blessing it he broke it, gave it to them and said. . . .

⁹For the purposes of this essay I will avoid the debate on whether the tradition of thanksgiving prayer (*Todah*) is more appropriate as a starting point than *berakah*. On these issues, see Thomas Talley, "From Berakah to Eucharistia: A Reopening Question," *Worship* 50 (1976): 115-37; idem., "The Literary Structure of the Eucharistic Prayer," *Worship* 58 (1984); Robert J. Ledogar, *Acknowledgment: Praise Verbs in the Early Greek Anaphoras* (Rome: Herder, 1968); Cesare Girauda, *La Struttura Letteraria della Preghiera Eucaristica* (= *Analecta Biblica* 92) (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1981); Enrico Mazza, *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer*, trans. Ronald E. Lane (Collegeville MN: Liturgical Press, 1995).

¹⁰See the excellent summary essay on this subject by Lawrence A. Hoffman, "Rabbinic *Berakah* and Jewish Spirituality," in *Asking and Thanking* (= *Concilium* 1990/1993), ed. C. Duquoc and C. Florestan (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990) 18-30.

¹¹*Ibid.*, 20; see also Joseph Heinemann, *Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns* (= *Studia Judaica: Forschungen zur Wissenschaft des Judentums* 9) (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977); Moshe Greenberg, *Biblical Prose Prayer: As a Window to the Popular Religion of Ancient Israel* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983) 32-37; Samuel E. Balentine, *Prayer in the Hebrew Bible: The Drama of Divine Human Dialogue* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993) 199-259.

But this is a mistranslation of the Greek which has *eulogesas* (after saying the blessing) instead of "blessed it." The Roman liturgical tradition was guilty of the same error in accompanying the word *benedixit* in the institution narrative with a sign of the Cross.¹² The point of Jewish prayer of table blessing is not that we bless or ask God to bless what is not holy, but rather that by acknowledging (*berakh-ing*) God this food and drink becomes usable by human beings. Thus all things are holy—at least potentially so, for human beings, but these things do not enter the realm of the useable until God is acknowledged for them. The translator of this verse in the NRSV was apparently unaware of this theology of Jewish blessing. It seems to have disappeared quite early and was operative in what Bernard Cooke has called "the distancing of God." I suspect that the deathblow to this spirituality as sacramental or liturgical came with the encounter of mediterranean Christianity and the Germanic cultures of the North.¹³

I should make clear here that I do not pretend here to provide a full account of the nature of Jewish prayer or to suggest that there are not other distinctions (clean/unclean) that are important to that tradition—nor am I trying to say that the more conventional notion of blessing is not used in the religious tradition of Israel. I am merely trying to show that the prayer form which underlies the Eucharist is (to use Edward Kilmartin's term) *anabatic* or ascending in character and that it shifts our understanding of consecration. My contention is, as I set out at the beginning of this section, that a new paradigm for sacramental activity, or a High Sacramentality from below, will have important consequences for our understanding of ministerial leadership for our paradigm enables us to (1) look to the life of the community for the development of roles of leadership and (2) rethink what has traditionally been called consecration. In order to consider these consequences we can proceed further with our second and third questions.

II. WHAT ARE THE BASES FOR DECIDING ABOUT MINISTERIAL ROLES?

The second question posed here will build upon our first consideration: the nature of sacramentality. Given a spirituality and theology of prayer and sacrament, as it were "from below," what would be the yield for issues of ministerial

¹²On the medieval debate over what this *benedixit* might mean, see Pierre-Marie Gy, "Les paroles de la consécration et l'unité de la prière eucharistique selon les théologiens de Pierre Lombard à S. Thomas D'Aquin," in *Lex Orandi, Lex Credendi: Miscellanea in Onore di P. Cipriano Vagaggini (Studia Anselmiana 79)*, ed. G. J. Békés and G. Farnedi (Rome: Editrice Anselmiana, 1980) 225-27.

¹³Bernard Cooke, *The Distancing of God: The Ambiguity of Symbol in History and Theology* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1990). See also James C. Russell, *The Germanization of Early Medieval Christianity: A Sociohistorical Approach to Religious Transformation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994) 107-33.

leadership? Or, to put it another way, what would ministerial leadership of the Eucharist look like if we took human leadership in community as a starting point?

First, however, we must deal with the question of representation—the sticking point of so much of the modern debate over ordained ministry. The Christian tradition has consistently affirmed that it is Christ who baptizes, anoints, offers himself at the Eucharist, etc.¹⁴ The sacraments are acts of Christ, head and members. Thus, they are first and foremost ecclesial acts. At least from the time of Augustine the Church has dealt with the question of unworthy ministers by insisting on the activity of the whole Christ. It is only within this context that it makes sense to speak of ordained ministers, even when we recognize their gifts as God-given.

On the other hand the medieval development of a theology of sacerdotal character, especially in St. Thomas, made the priest a representative of Christ, that is, said that he acted *in persona Christi*, because of a sacramental configuration to Christ. Thus, in Bernard Marliangeas' study of the topic *in persona Christi/in persona Ecclesiae* in St. Thomas, representation does not have the aspect of delegation so much as organic representation.¹⁵ Dennis Michael Ferrara has refined this reading of St. Thomas by arguing that with regard to eucharistic consecration the priest acts not as representative so much as in self-effacement. In other words in the instance of the eucharistic institution narrative, considered as "words of consecration" the priest acts *in persona Christi* precisely because of his *inability* to represent Christ in any organic way.¹⁶ As I hope to argue in the third part of this essay, Ferrara does not go far enough. A sacramental theology from below, as well as a sacramental theology that depends upon a close reading of the rites and their history, needs to question the very notion of a consecratory formula. And in fact the recent debate on the subject of *in persona Christi* (or *in persona Christi Capitis*) has failed to ask just this question.¹⁷

¹⁴Augustine, *Tractate on John VI,7* (PL 35:1428).

¹⁵Bernard-Dominique Marliangeas, *Clés pour une théologie du ministère: in persona Christi, in persona Ecclesiae* (=Theologie Historique) (Paris: Editions Beauchesne, 1978) 138: "L'Eglise ne delegue pas les pretres pour prier a la place de la communauté ecclésiastique; mais les prêtres, parce qu'établis dans la conformité au sacerdoce unique du Christ, peuvent, par la même, être les organes par lesquels l'Eglise, communauté des croyants, Corps mystique du Christ, prie et professe sa foi." See also the excellent summary by David Power, "Representing Christ in Community and Sacrament," in *Being A Priest Today*, ed. Donald Goergen (Collegeville MN: Liturgical Press, 1992) 97-123.

¹⁶Dennis Michael Ferrara, Representation or Self-Effacement? The Axiom *In Persona Christi* in St. Thomas and the Magisterium," *Theological Studies* 55 (1994): 195-224.

¹⁷From the Roman Catholic magisterium, see Vatican II: *Sacrosanctum Concilium* #33; *Lumen Gentium* #10 (where the role of the priest *in persona Christi* is to effect the eucharistic sacrifice); *Presbyterorum Ordinis* # 2; John Paul II, *Dominicae cenae* (Notitiae 1980, 125-144) #8.

Moreover, as Elizabeth Picken has argued, bridegroom imagery for Christ and therefore the presiding minister (in *Inter Insigniores* for example) is misused if it fails to attend to the metaphorical and analogical origin of such terms.¹⁸ Taking a useful metaphor like Bridegroom from the tradition and raising it to a principle of theology is dangerous business, for it fails to respect the genre in which the metaphor has been proposed and runs the risk of ideological misuse. Subsequent literature on *in persona Christi* has revolved around the question of maleness and Christ as "Head" (or *in persona Christi Capitis*).¹⁹ In any case one must ask the following question: if St. Augustine was right in saying that is it Christ who baptizes, why and how would one make a case for limiting the gender of the minister in the special case of the Eucharist? In other words, can a persuasive argument be found to conclude that Christ must act as "Head" in a way that is personally represented in the Eucharist in a manner that is not affirmed in other sacramental acts? The answer to this questions depends on how one understands the Eucharist itself, as I hope to show below in the third part of this essay.

The notion of personal representation raises a host of questions: the nature of the Eucharist and eucharistic consecration, the role of ordained ministry, the limitation of priesthood in the Western Church to celibate males, the general nature of sacramental representation in the communication of grace, and the notion of sacramental character.²⁰ These questions cannot be dealt with in any depth here and so I will limit myself to suggesting that in terms of representation the idea that there is a *natural* resemblance between the minister and Christ has yet to be demonstrated persuasively—especially vis-à-vis the Eucharist where the consecrated elements represent Christ as well.

Before moving to a more positive assessment of the qualities desirable in the president of the liturgy, I must linger on one other aspect of the limits that have been placed upon this role—sexual continence. I avoid the term "celibacy" because I think it only confuses the question, since sexual continence was an issue for the clergy long before the legislation in the West at the Second Lateran

¹⁸Elizabeth J. Picken, "Forum: If Christ Is Bridegroom, The Priest Must Be Male?" *Worship* 67 (1993): 273-78. Picken is responding in particular to Sara Butler, "The Priest as Sacrament of Christ the Bridegroom," *Worship* 66 (1992): 498-517. See also, John Baldovin, "Liturgical Presidency: The Sacramental Question," in *Disciples at the Crossroads: Perspectives on Worship and Church Leadership*, ed. Eleanor Bernstein (Collegeville MN: Liturgical Press, 1993) 39.

¹⁹See, e.g., Susan Wood, "Priestly Identity: Sacrament of the Ecclesial Community," *Worship* 69 (1995): 109-27; Sara Butler, "Priestly Identity: 'Sacrament' of Christ the Head," *Worship* 70 (1996): 290-306; Lawrence Welch, "Priestly Identity Reconsidered: A Reply to Susan Wood," *Worship* 67 (1996): 307-18.

²⁰See Hervé-Marie Legrand, "The 'Indelible' Character and the Theology of Ministry," in *The Plurality of Ministries (=Concilium: Religion in the Seventies 74)*, ed. Hans Kung and Walter Kasper (New York: Herder & Herder, 1972) 54-62.

Council of 1139.²¹ It is well known that since the fourth century abstinence from sexual activity has been an ideal with regard to the liturgical leadership of the Eucharist.²² That is, presbyters were expected to refrain from sexual activity prior to the celebration of the Eucharist. In fact such abstinence seems to have been expected on the model of priests in Israelite religion when they had to serve at the altar. To what extent ritual purity, rather than asceticism in general, in relation to cult entered into the expectation of continence in major clerics is not quite clear. There seems to have been, however, a commonly accepted sexual abstinence in relation to the altar in both Israelite religion and contemporary paganism.²³ All the same, ritual purity seems to have been a factor in the development of clerical celibacy and hence restrictions on service at the altar.

There are, of course, a number of very good arguments about the value of celibacy (witness of the kingdom, singlemindedness, countercultural symbol).²⁴ Surely, very few if any theologians today would base an argument on behalf of celibacy on the value of sexual abstinence vis-à-vis Christian worship.²⁵ A modern view of sexuality does not seem to allow for a view that would render a person ritually impure after engaging in sexual activity. Similarly, since food codes are traditionally related to sexual codes, the contemporary Church seems

²¹Here I agree with Edward Schillebeeckx, *The Church With a Human Face: A New and Expanded Theology of Ministry*, trans. John Bowden (New York: Crossroad, 1985) 242.

²²E.g., see Daniel Callam, "The Frequency of the Mass in the Latin Church ca. 400," *Theological Studies* 45 (1985): 615-26; idem., "Clerical Continence in the Fourth Century: Three Papal Decrees," *Theological Studies* 41 (1980): 3-50; Roger Gryson, "Aux origines du célibat ecclésiastique: La continence culturelle des clercs majeurs dans l'ancienne église d'Occident," *Corona Gratiarum: Miscellanea patristica, historica et liturgica Eligio Dekkers, O.S.B. XII lustra complenti oblata* (Bruges: Sint Pietersabdij, 1975) 123-28; Raymund Kottje, "Das Aufkommen der täglichen Eucharistiefeier in der Westliche Kirche und die Zölibatsforderung," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 81 (1971): 218-28; Samuel Laeuchli, *Power and Sexuality: The Emergence of Canon Law at the Synod of Elvira* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1972); Peter Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988) 203, 358, 377-78; idem., "Late Antiquity," in *A History of Private Life*, vol. 1, ed. Paul Veyne (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1987) 269-70.

²³See Edward Schillebeeckx, *Ministry: Leadership in the Community of Jesus Christ* (New York: Crossroad, 1981) 85-88; Aline Rousselle, *Porneia: On Desire and the Body in Antiquity*, trans. Felicia Pheasant (New York: Basil Blackwell, 1988).

²⁴Though I agree with the position of Schillebeeckx, *Church*, 248, that the contemporary credibility of celibacy depends on its being voluntary.

²⁵This is the view taken by Paul Beaudette in "Ritual Purity in Roman Catholic Priesthood: Using the Work of Mary Douglas to Understand Clerical Celibacy" (Ph.D. diss., Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, 1994); see also Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London: Routledge, Kegan, Paul, 1966).

to have abandoned (at least in practice) much concern with fasting prior to liturgical celebration. Paul Beaudette has argued that the Second Vatican Council's positive estimation of marriage led to dropping ritual purity as a motivation for clerical celibacy, leading to a confusion of the boundaries between Church and world that ritual purity had maintained, and has thus thrown the logic of mandatory celibacy for the clergy into chaos.²⁶ In addition he suggests that questions of ritual purity are deeply involved in the ongoing exclusion of women from Roman Catholic ordained ministry.²⁷ I have long suspected that this is the case.²⁸ There are profound psychological and anthropological motivations for regarding women as fundamentally impure and therefore incapable of liturgical service. Of course the difficulty with this explanation is that it rests on a hermeneutic of suspicion about the motives people have had in denying leadership roles to women and sexually active men, but little is to be gained by ignoring this factor. Exploring this hidden presumption should be the task of religious psychologists and cultural anthropologists. Until it is dealt with, the question of women in ordained ministry will remain at an impasse, with neither "side" of the debate able to convince the other with regard to the issues of the will of Christ, consistent tradition, or sacramental representation.

Let me summarize at this point. So far I have questioned the notion of sacramental representation as natural resemblance and the issues of ritual purity with regard to liturgical presidency. But these are rather negative approaches to our topic. What can be said positively about the nature of eucharistic leadership? In the first place leadership of the Eucharist has been tied to leadership of the community. The community's leader in faith, representing its unity, served as its leader in worship.²⁹ On the other hand, as David Power has suggested:

[I]t would betray the early sense of Church not to see that Eucharist and community are reciprocal realities and that celebrating the Eucharist is essential to being pastor of the community.³⁰

We should not too quickly presume, therefore, that community leadership led to eucharistic leadership, for it may have been precisely the charismatic religious qualities of a leader of worship that led to community leadership. It is worthwhile to dwell on this notion. The charismatic ability of someone to pray may

²⁶Ibid., 25.

²⁷Ibid., iv.

²⁸See John Baldovin, "The Eucharist: Who May Preside?" *Commonweal* (9 Sept 1988): 460-66; idem., "Liturgical Presidency," 39.

²⁹See Hervé-Marie Legrand, "The Presidency of the Eucharist according to the Ancient Tradition," in *Living Bread Saving Cup: Essays on the Eucharist*, 2nd ed., ed. R. K. Seasoltz (Collegeville MN: Liturgical Press, 1987) 1-30; Paul Bradshaw, *Liturgical Presidency in the Early Church* (Bramcote, Nottinghamshire: Grove Books, 1983).

³⁰David Power, *The Eucharistic Mystery: Revitalizing the Tradition* (New York: Crossroad, 1992) 79.

be precisely what led that person into eucharistic presidency and the leadership of the community. Surely this would sound strange to modern ears since no particular charism seems needed to pray a eucharistic or any other form of public prayer in the Church. After all, it does not take much ability to read a printed eucharistic prayer aloud, although truly praying the prayer takes some spiritual talent. In the Church of the first three centuries, however, the eucharistic prayer was improvised by the president of the assembly. In that case the person who could reach into Scripture and tradition to express the *eucharistia* of the assembled community may have been considered to have a considerable charism—a pray-er who could voice the community's faith, albeit most probably according to certain set structures of prayer in that community's tradition.³¹ When eucharistic prayers became set texts in the late fourth and early fifth centuries the obvious connection between the charism of eucharistic praying and leadership would have been lost—or better transferred to other considerations like ritual purity.

Of course this argument hinges on the supposition that ministerial leadership of the Eucharist (not to mention the other ritual activities of the Church) has more to do with demonstrated abilities or charisms than with a particular state in life or gender. I would want to argue that what we mean by ordained presbyterial ministry today should be characterized by two sets of considerations: first, the individual's affirmation of a desire to follow a call from God to permanent service of the Church and second, the community's perception that this person has the following four charisms: (1) ability to lead the community in service, (2) ability to articulate the community's faith in preaching and witness to the Gospel, (3) ability to voice the community's faith by public prayer, and (4) ability to lead an exemplary public life of witness to the Gospel. Such a standard would both preserve the distinctiveness of the ordained presbyterate and episcopate as well as clarify the relation between the ordained and the rest of the community—as it were *from below*. I willingly confess that this model of ministerial leadership is rather far from the strictures presently placed upon those who preside at the eucharist of the Roman Rite, since it would require considerable ability of a presider to be able to appropriately improvise eucharistic praying in touch with a valuable tradition and at the same time the needs of a particular community.³² Thus I am arguing a middle course in the debate that raged between Puritans and

³¹See Allan Bouley, *From Freedom to Formula: The Evolution of the Eucharistic Prayer from Oral Improvisation to Written Texts* (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1981).

³²I mean that presiders are not permitted, currently, to change anything in the liturgy; see *Sacrosanctum Concilium* #22:3.

Anglicans in the seventeenth century over the nature of liturgical prayer,³³ to the extent that one must rely on the prudence of the minister to pray appropriately.

One more quality of leadership needs to be added in light of the contemporary reform of the eucharistic rite in the Roman Church. It is clear in the documents of the reform that ministerial leadership of the Eucharist (and other liturgical acts) is not considered to be a solo activity. The model of eucharistic liturgy proposed by the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, not to mention the text of the liturgy itself, presupposed a coordinated ministerial leadership, where a number of people play a part, depending upon the gifts that have been given to them: some as readers, some as assistants at the holy table, some as musicians, some as proclaimers of the Gospel and formulators of the assembly's intercessions (deacons), some as welcomers in the assembly. With regard to deacons, one may lament the fact that the revisors of the contemporary Roman Rite did not pay more attention to the facilitating role of deacon in the liturgies of the Eastern churches. In the Eastern rites deacons constantly lead prayers and give directions, and deal directly with the assembly far more than the presider. Westerners could have learned from this more corporate model of liturgical leadership.

Therefore I suggest that leadership is a shared activity in the liturgy of the Roman Rite and the perceived dominance of the ordained presider is an anomaly that needs to be rectified—more in practice than in theory. Therefore, another desirable charism in the ordained leader of the community is the ability to share leadership.

In this section we have been attempting to sketch out the qualities desirable in the leader of the assembly's eucharistic praying. I have attempted to move our current thinking on such leadership away from considerations of representation by "natural resemblance" and toward the personal charisms or gifts that one finds desirable in leading the Church at prayer. One task remains: to show that the model I have proposed for ministerial leadership is consistent with the nature of the Eucharist itself.

III. LEADERSHIP AND CONTEMPORARY LITURGICAL THEOLOGY OF THE EUCHARIST

Theological reflection on the Eucharist has made enormous strides in the course of the past century. We cannot possibly even sketch the most important developments here except to note the gains reflected in the various bilateral and multilateral conversations and dialogues since Vatican II with a view toward healing the doctrinal divisions of the past millenium (with the Orthodox and other Oriental Churches) and of the past five hundred years (with the Protestants

³³See Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England*, vol. 2 (Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1961-1975).

and Anglicans).³⁴ Great progress has been made with regard to questions of eucharistic presence and sacrifice, especially in the recovery of a biblical notion of *memorial*. As David Power has pointed out in *The Sacrifice We Offer*, however, the greatest stumbling blocks present themselves when dealing with the relation between priesthood and sacrifice.³⁵ Perhaps what we have seen in parts one and two of this essay may provide some further insights to overcoming those stumbling blocks.

Earlier I proposed that the primary meaning of *blessing* be understood as the acknowledgement that we make of God and God's mighty acts, thus rendering things and activities accessible to us human beings. I have also suggested some ways that leadership in that activity of blessing might be understood. What then can be said about the precise role of the ordained minister as leader of eucharistic worship? What consequences might those conclusions have? (Note that I am avoiding the terminology of *priesthood*, since use of that vocabulary already prejudices the question. In other words I understand the sacerdotalized vocabulary of the Christian Church since the third century as problematic.³⁶ The use of sacerdotal vocabulary arose originally out of a desire to construe an ironic meaning for sacrifice in the ancient world out of Christian application of Malachi 1:1: "a pure offering for my name is great among the nations." In other words, early Christians had no sacrifice in the commonly accepted sense of the term; nor did they have a priesthood (except for Christ who is after all a very odd priest in traditional religious terms). They were, however, able to claim themselves as religious by using such cultic vocabulary, but in an ironic fashion. Thus Christian priesthood must always be viewed metaphorically.³⁷)

³⁴Two noteworthy collections of these materials are *Growth in Agreement: Reports and Agreed Statements of Ecumenical Conversations on a World Level*, ed. Harding Meyer and Lucas Vischer (New York: Paulist Press, 1984) and *Building Unity: Ecumenical Dialogues with Roman Catholic Participation in the United States*, ed. Joseph Burgess and Jeffrey Gros (New York: Paulist Press, 1989).

³⁵David Power, *The Sacrifice We Offer: The Tridentine Dogma and Its Reinterpretation* (New York: Crossroad, 1987) 17-21, 172-76. On the question of priesthood and eucharist in the contemporary Roman Catholic magisterium, see, e.g., *Churches Respond to BEM: Official Responses to the "Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry" Text*, vol. 6, ed. Max Thurian (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1988), "Roman Catholic Church," 29, where the official Roman response has difficulties precisely with the ecclesiological dimension of the Lima text's treatment of eucharist; see also, John Paul II, *The Mystery and Worship of the Holy Eucharist (=Dominicae Cense)* #9, in *Church, Eucharist, and Priesthood*, ed. Edward Kilmartin (New York: Paulist Press, 1981).

³⁶See the trenchant comments of Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament*, 308-10, esp. in nn. 31-32. On the vocabulary of priesthood, see Thomas J. Talley, "Priesthood in Baptism and Ordination," in his *Reforming Tradition* (Washington: Pastoral Press, 1990) 1-9.

³⁷Here I follow the persuasive argument of Gordon Lathrop, *Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993) 139-58; see also David Power, "Words That Crack: The Uses of 'Sacrifice' in Eucharistic Discourse," *Worship* 53 (1979): 386-404;

Here I am taking as a given that Catholic theology affirms the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the eucharisticized elements (and in recent theology within the assembly, its ministers and the Word as well). In fact the multiple presences of Christ will be crucial for our conclusions.³⁸ I am also taking as a given from the tradition that Catholic theology wants to affirm the closest possible relation between the eucharistic action and the salvific activity of Christ, for which the metaphor of sacrifice has traditionally been employed.

But in order to understand these traditional affirmations I will employ a liturgical (or *lex orandi*) approach to the Eucharist. By a liturgical approach I mean one which bases itself on the actual unfolding of the liturgy itself or reading a theology off of the rites. In order to do this one must reverse the order in which the two main subjects of eucharistic theology have been discussed since the Middle Ages (and indeed the emphasis given to discerning the eucharistic presence since the debate between Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus of Corbie in the ninth century). One must deal first with the Eucharist as action (sacrifice) and only then with eucharistic presence.³⁹

The eucharistic liturgy proper proceeds from the Liturgy of the Word in the universal dynamic of all Christian worship: proclamation and response. Nothing is done in Christian worship without first hearing the Word of God. This is the liturgy's ultimate anti-Pelagianism. Note that the role of the president of the assembly is rather muted in the Liturgy of the Word: it consists of gathering the assembly in prayer and then articulating the assembly's response in faith by preaching.⁴⁰ The actual proclamation of the word is assigned properly to other ministers: readers, deacons and musicians. It is even preferable that in the absence of a deacon a presbyter other than the president proclaim the Gospel.⁴¹ There follows the assembly's exercise of its proper priesthood in making prayers of intercession.⁴² The Eucharist proper begins with the presentation of the gifts and preparation of the holy table, followed by the eucharistic prayer and the rites which surround holy communion and finally the dismissal. In his classic, *The*

Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament*, 303-16.

³⁸See the treatment of this subject in Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy* (n.6, above), 1:305-50.

³⁹I am indebted here to Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (New York: Seabury Press, 1982), who first alerted me to the importance of this reversal and also to E. L. Mascall, *Corpus Christi: Essays on the Church and the Eucharist* (London: Longman's, 1965).

⁴⁰I am not arguing that only the president of the assembly can preach but merely that this is the president's ordinary role in line with the criteria I argued above with regard to ordination. See John Baldwin, "Biblical Preaching in the Liturgy," *Studia Liturgica* 22 (1992): 103-104.

⁴¹*General Introduction to the Lectionary*, #49.

⁴²*GIRM* # 45. If the American adaptations to the revised ICEL Sacramentary are approved, the greeting of peace may take place at the end of the intercessions.

Shape of the Liturgy, Gregory Dix saw in this sequence a universal fourfold shape (taking, blessing, breaking, and giving) that expressed the Church's adaptation of the verbs attributed to Christ's actions at the Last Supper and other New Testament passages influenced by eucharistic practice. It is not my contention to defend Dix's argument in detail. One can agree with a number of modern commentators⁴³ in criticizing the details of Dix's argument and still affirm that he was fundamentally correct in understanding the eucharist as the communal *action* of the whole assembled church.

Dix's fourfold shape can easily be reduced to two actions: the blessing/thanking over bread and wine and the sharing of these eucharistized elements. I contend that this shape adequately expresses in ritual action the identity of Christ, whose life, death and resurrection can be summed up as a *Berakah* (or praise and acknowledgement) of God and whose person is thereby broken and poured out for us. Thus Christ's identity is rendered by the ritual playing out of his basic activity: utter self-giving and faithful obedience to the one he calls *Abba*. One can find some warrant for this "ritual approach" in a fourth century mystagogical homily on baptism commonly attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem. Cyril says to the newly baptized:

What a strange and astonishing situation! We did not really die, we were not really buried, we did not really hang from a cross and rise again. Our imitation was symbolic, but our salvation a reality. . . . For Christ really died, his soul really was separated from his body; he really was buried, for his holy body was wrapped in pure linen. In his case all these events really occurred; but in your case there was a likeness of death and suffering, but the reality, not the likeness, of salvation.⁴⁴

Cyril is playing here with the terms symbol (*eikon*), truth (*aletheia*), and likeness (*homoioma*). Although I doubt that today one would want to adopt the basically Platonic scheme that underlies Cyril's thought, I think we have learned enough about the power of symbol and ritual to be able to say that, just as in Cyril's exposition of the relation of baptism to the dying and rising of Christ, one can affirm a ritual continuity between the Eucharist and that same dying and rising. This would be a dangerous argument (in the sense that it could lead to ritualism) were it not for the epicletic dimension of eucharistic prayer that will be dealt with below. Thus, I have some qualms with David Power's rejection of

⁴³Robert Taft, *The Great Entrance: A History of the Transfer of Gifts and other Preanaphoral Rites in the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom* (= *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 22) (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 1975) 16-17; Kenneth Stevenson, *Gregory Dix: Twenty-five Years On* (= *Grove Liturgical Study* #10) (Bramcote, Nottinghamshire: Grove Books, 1977).

⁴⁴Cyril of Jerusalem, *Baptismal Homily* #2: 5-7, in *The Awe-Inspiring Rites of Initiation: The Origins of the R.C.I.A.*, 2nd ed., ed. Edward Yarnold (Collegeville MN: Liturgical Press, 1994) 78-79.

representational symbolism via ritual. He rules out the broader ritual representational structure that can be discerned in the celebration of the eucharist by ruling out any use of representation at all.⁴⁵ I mean that instead of looking to the actions of the presider as representational, we can look to the actions of the assembly. There is no denying the central role of prayer (blessing) in all of this and, it seems to me, one is safeguarded from a merely ritualistic notion of eucharistic action.

Therefore from the basic dynamic or action of the eucharistic liturgy I am arguing that the Eucharist is fundamentally a communal enterprise in which, since the point of the ritual is incorporation into Christ, the whole Christ, head and members, must be the agent. Therefore the first consideration in eucharistic celebration should be the communal "doing" of Christ. In his *Corpus Mysticum*, Henri de Lubac demonstrated that prior to the High Middle Ages this was precisely the understanding of the relation of the Church to the Eucharist.⁴⁶ If this is the case, the entire Western synthesis since the twelfth century (as Edward Kilmartin has argued) has been misdirected in isolating the consecratory activity of the priest in the words of the eucharistic institution narrative.⁴⁷ Criticism of this synthesis can be grounded in the historical development of the eucharistic prayer.

As far as we are able to tell there is no single original eucharistic prayer from which all others are derived. The earliest prayers (and indeed commonly well into the fourth century) were improvised most likely according to a community's schema of liturgical prayer.⁴⁸ The evidence that we do have for prayers composed prior to the fourth century do not reveal the use of the Last Supper as an institution narrative, except in the case of the *Apostolic Tradition*. Even the dating of that document to the early third century has been seriously questioned.⁴⁹ Enrico Mazza has argued that the early prayers did have institution narratives in the sense of references to biblical passages as warrants for the celebration. For example, Deuteronomy 8:10 ("You shall eat your fill and bless the Lord your God for the good land that he has given you.") acts as a kind of narrative of institution for the second thanksgiving in the *Didache* 10:3a, and

⁴⁵See David Power, "Representing Christ," 116-18; idem., *Eucharistic Mystery*, 44-45.

⁴⁶Henri de Lubac, *Corpus Mysticum: L'eucharistie et l'église au moyen-âge*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Aubier, 1949).

⁴⁷Edward Kilmartin, "The Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology: Towards the Third Millennium," *Theological Studies* 55 (1994): 405-57, esp. 431-43.

⁴⁸See Bouley, *Freedom to Formula*, 89-158.

⁴⁹Paul Bradshaw, "Redating the *Apostolic Tradition*: Some Preliminary Steps," in *Rule of Prayer, Rule of Faith: Essays in Honor of Aidan Kavanagh, OSB*, ed. N. Mitchell and J. Baldovin (Collegeville MN: Liturgical Press, 1996) 8-9; See Marcel Metzger, "Enquêtes autour de la prétendue Tradition apostolique," *Ecclesia Orans* 9 (1992): 241-59.

Malachi 1:11 ("a pure offering . . .") serves the same purpose in the prayer of *Papyrus Strasbourg 254*.⁵⁰

Instead of a prayer which is constructed around a consecratory formula, the early anaphoras contain a series of blessings (or thanksgivings) and petition more or less connected. Cesare Giraudo has argued that the weight a tradition gives to the notion of a moment of consecration is dependent upon the eventual placing of the Last Supper narrative in either the blessing (anamnetic) or petitionary (epicletic) portion of the prayer.⁵¹ But even in those prayers (like that of the *Apostolic Tradition* and the *Anaphora of St. John Chrysostom*), which place it in the anamnetic section, the institution narrative acts more like the elaboration of the warrant or pattern for praying according to the structure of the eucharistic action than it does like a formula of consecration.⁵²

I trust that the logic behind this rather long excursus into the history of the eucharistic prayer is rather clear. If there was no institution narrative as we conceive it in the Ante-Nicene Church, then neither was there a moment of consecration in the manner that scholastic theology conceived it. If the role of the Last Supper narrative within eucharistic prayers is to act as the warrant for the shape of the celebration and its origin then using the terminology of *in persona Christi* is beside the point. As Edward Kilmartin pointed out repeatedly Western theology has suffered from a Christomonism that left little room for an adequate development of pneumatology in liturgical prayer. Since the notion of institution

⁵⁰See Enrico Mazza, *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer*, trans. Ronald Lane (Collegeville MN: Liturgical Press, 1995) 22-23, 190-94. The Ante-Nicene anaphoras which contain no Last Supper narrative are: *Didache* 9-10 (A. Hänggi and I. Pahl, eds., *Præx Eucharistica: Textus e Variis Liturgiis Antiquioribus Selecti (=Spicilegium Friburgense #12* [Fribourg, Suisse: Editions Universitaires, 1968] 66-68; hereafter PE); *Apostolic Constitutions* VII:26-27 (R.C.D. Jasper and G.J. Cuming, eds., *Prayer of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed*, 3rd ed. [Collegeville MN: Liturgical Press, 1987] 101-102); *Papyrus Strasbourg 254* (PE 116-19); *Mystagogical Catecheses of Cyril of Jerusalem* (PE 206-209); *Mystagogical Catecheses of Theodore of Mopsuestia* (PE 214-18); *Anaphora of Addai and Mari* (PE 375-80).

⁵¹Cesare Giraudo, *La Struttura Letteraria della Preghiera Eucaristica (=Analecta Biblica 92)* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1981).

⁵²In the contemporary eucharistic prayers of the Roman Rite this point would be clearer if the relative pronoun "who" (*qui*) had been translated. As it is both typography and grammar make the institution narrative seem like a consecratory insertion into the prayer. It would be useful for a scholar to check the medieval manuscripts to find precisely when a different calligraphy began to be employed for the institution narrative. On the medieval development of theology about the institution narrative, see Richard Buxton, *Eucharist and Institution Narrative: A Study of the Roman and Anglican Traditions of the Consecration of the Eucharist from the Eighth to the Twentieth Centuries (Alcuin Club Collections 58)* (Great Wakering: Mayhew-McCrimmon Ltd., 1976); Gy, *Les paroles*.

by Christ became a major focus during the eleventh century Gregorian Reform there has been little development of the pneumatological element up until recent times.⁵³

But it is precisely the pneumatological or epiclesis element that I mentioned above that safeguards the ritual interpretation I have given to the shape of the Eucharist, for it shows that nothing happens in the Church's prayer without the invocation of God. Though an explicit epiclesis of the Holy Spirit is not present in a number of the earliest prayers, I would argue that the petitionary element found universally in both *berakah* and *todah* forms of Jewish eucharology served as the seedbed for this development. Thus Eastern theology has been on surer ground in pointing to the epiclesis as a moment of consecration, although limiting the notion of consecration to one moment is not necessary given my theory about the entire shape and content of the eucharistic action.⁵⁴ Moreover, it is helpful to note that the epiclesis acts in the Eucharist proper in a manner analogous to the proclamation of the Word. What the Church does, it does by imploring God's presence and action, not by its own power. Had this been made clearer, even on the basis of the Roman Canon, there would have been little ground for the accusation of liturgical Pelagianism at the time of the sixteenth century reform.

My comments on the eucharistic prayer may have seemed like a detour, but it is necessary to free ourselves from the rather narrowly construed scholastic theology of form and matter as well as a rather mechanically conceived notion of the "cause of grace" in the sacraments in order to ground a theology more consonant with the liturgical tradition as a whole and with contemporary needs. The upshot of the argument is this: the whole assembly offers the eucharistic sacrifice in union with Christ by identifying itself with his life of praise and thanksgiving and by invocation of the Holy Spirit. The fruit of such self-offering is communion in the life of God. Of all the contemporary efforts at eucharistic praying, the United Methodist postinstitution narrative anamnesis/offering expresses this notion best:

⁵³See Wendelin Knoch, *Die Einsetzung der Sakramente durch Christus: Eine Untersuchung zur Sakramententheologie der Frühscholastik von Anselm von Laon bis zu Wilhelm von Auxerre* (Munich: Aschendorff, 1983).

⁵⁴This raises the question of the split or double epiclesis in contemporary Roman eucharistic prayers, i.e., placing a consecratory epiclesis before the institution narrative in order to ensure the narrative's pride of place. See Thomas Talley, "Eucharistic Prayers: Past, Present and Future," in *Revising the Eucharist: Groundwork for the Anglican Communion* (=Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 27), ed. David Holeton (Bramcote: Nottinghamshire: Grove Books, 1994) 13-18; John McKenna, "The Epiclesis Revisited," in *New Eucharistic Prayers: An Ecumenical Study of Their Development and Structure*, ed. Frank Senn (New York: Paulist, 1987) 169-94.

And so in remembrance of these your mighty acts in Jesus Christ, we offer ourselves in praise and thanksgiving as a holy and living sacrifice in union with Christ's offering for us, as we proclaim the mystery of faith. . . ."⁵⁵

CONCLUSION

What, then, does the ordained presbyter or bishop do at the Eucharist? He acts as the local community's representative of unity with the wider Church and with tradition. He leads the assembly in prayer and action by articulating the Church's thanksgiving, memorial and invocation on the basis of the qualities enumerated in the second section of this essay. To attempt to say more is to jeopardize the fundamental ability of the baptized to represent Christ in the world, an activity which lies at the basis of what I have called "sacramentality from below."

A number of consequences flow from this approach to ministerial leadership in the eucharist. First (and foremost) ministerial leadership is misconceived when it is limited to a single ordained minister. Ministerial activity in eucharistic celebration is of its nature communal, based upon the varied gifts shared by members of the assembly.⁵⁶ Second, our approach calls into question the wisdom of the current Roman Catholic situation of celebration of holy communion on Sundays in the absence of a priest since such celebrations focus on the presence aspect of the Eucharist at the expense of entering into the action of Christ.⁵⁷ Moreover, many of those who lead such celebrations actually fulfill the requirements that have been outlined in this study. Third, the posture of the assembly and the gestures of the priest during the eucharistic prayer need to be reexamined in light of a more communally based understanding of the offering of the Eucharist.⁵⁸ In other words the wisdom of the assembly adopting a different posture from the ministers at the holy table or of the priest touching and elevating the elements during the institution narrative needs to be questioned.

⁵⁵*The United Methodist Book of Worship* (Nashville: United Methodist Publishing House, 1992) 38.

⁵⁶See the various essays in the St. Serge Liturgical Conference for 1976, *Roles in the Liturgical Assembly*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (New York: Pueblo Publishing Co., 1981).

⁵⁷See James Dallen, *The Dilemma of Priestless Sundays* (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1994).

⁵⁸On gesture, see John Leonard & Nathan Mitchell, *The Postures of the Assembly During the Eucharistic Prayer* (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1996); on gesture, see John Baldovin, "Accept Panem: The Gestures of the Priest at the Institution Narrative of the Eucharist," in Mitchell and Baldovin, *Rule of Prayer*, 123-39.

Fourth, the frequency and nature of presbyteral concelebration when such concelebration counteracts the unity of the assembly must be criticized.⁵⁹

Finally, the time is opportune to open the question of shared presidency in liturgical leadership. Need the unity of the Church, as local and worldwide always be signified by a single leader? Could this unity be better symbolized by a shared leadership of the presidency of the assembly? Does this not already happen to some extent when one minister preaches and another presides at the table?

We began with the hope that asking the right questions might better enable us to come to a deeper understanding of the role of ministerial leadership in the eucharist. Whether the right questions have been asked and whether adequate answers have been given to those questions is not for this writer to say. But one can express a further hope that they lead to the kind of dialogue about leadership which is critical for the growth of the church in the Spirit. Only with such dialogue can the eucharist become the communal symbol of unity with the activity and person of Christ that will make the question of leadership a truly secondary consideration.

JOHN F. BALDOVIN, SJ

Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley
Berkeley, California

⁵⁹See Gilbert Ostdiek, "Concelebration Revisited," in *Shaping English Liturgy: Studies in Honor of Archbishop Denis Hurley*, ed. Peter Finn & James Schellman (Washington: Pastoral Press, 1990) 139-72; John Baldwin, "Concelebration: A Problem of Symbolic Roles in the Church," *Worship* 59 (1985): 32-47.